

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/446,314	12/20/1999	Yasumasa Yamakoshi	216-429P	2146	
2292 BIRCH STEW	7590 06/27/2007 ART KOLASCH & BIRO	EXAMINER			
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ZEMEL, IRINA SOPJIA		
FALLS CHUR	Cri, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
·			. 1711	1711	
,					
		•	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/27/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/446,314	YAMAKOSHI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Irina S. Zemel	1711		

	Irina S. Zemel	1711				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 12 June 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	• • •					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
	liana with 27 OFB 44 27 mount by	£1				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	e appeal. Since			
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered b	ecause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		,,				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bei	• •	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:		1				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affidav	vit or other evidence is	necessary and			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	1				
13. Other:		Mafen	N			
		Irina S. Zemel Primary Examiner				

Art Unit: 1711

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The newly added limitation to the specific processing conditions has not been earlier presented for examination and requires additional serach and consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are directed to the claims as amended, however the newly added limitations directed to the specific centrifugal dehydration will not be entered at this stage of the prosecution as requiring additional serach and consideration. Insofar as the applicants arguments regarding the product claims, it appears that the centrifugal dehydration is not a critical limitation to obtain the product with the claimed parameters as the applicants own specification discloses, for example, gravity dehydration equally effective and all of the comparative results address diffenet process steps. Thus, it is still reasonable beliebved that the product disclosed in the reference inherently exhibit the claimed properties.